arXiv:1206.6990v4 [math.AP] 23 Jul 2012

# On the multivariate Burgers equation and the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation II

Jörg Kampen

July 24, 2012

**Abstract**

We consider global schemes with $H^2$-estimates for the multivariate Burgers equation and the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation in its Leray projection form. We extend the definition of a global scheme and the global $L^2$-theory of the multivariate Burgers equation to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation, where we consider estimates of the gradient of the pressure in its Leray projection form in $H^1$ at each each time step of the scheme. We use the fact that the data in our scheme are in $H^2$ at each time step such that the data for the Poisson equation related to the elimination of pressure are in $H^1$ at each approximation step. The growth of the velocity components is linear with respect to the $H^2$-norm on a time scale of time step size $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$ at each time step $l \geq 1$. The time-step size is 'minimal' in order to make the scheme global while at the same time it provides us with uniform bounds for the first order coefficients of linear approximations of the local solutions at each time step.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35K40, 35Q30.

## 1 Introduction

In [8] we considered a constructive global scheme for the multivariate Burgers equation

$$\left\lbrace\begin{array}{ll}\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t}=\nu\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial x_j^2}-\sum_{j=1}^n u_j\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j},\\ \\ \mathbf{u}(0,.)=\mathbf{h},\end{array}\right. \tag{1}$$

on a domain $[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^n$, and where the viscosity constant $\nu$ is strictly positive, i.e., $\nu > 0$. We assumed $h_i \in H^s \equiv H^s\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and do this henceforth in this paper. Furthermore, in order to have a uniform representation of the following argument we assume that $n \geq 3$. The differences to the Cauchy problem for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation, i.e.,

$$\left\lbrace \begin{array}{l}\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t}-\nu\Delta\mathbf{v}+(\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}=-\nabla p,\\ \\ \nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}=0,\qquad t\geq 0,\quad x\in{\mathbb R}^n,\\ \\ \mathbf{v}(0,.)=\mathbf{h},\end{array}\right. \tag{2}$$

are the source term in form of the negative gradient of the pressure, and the incompressibility condition. A classical solution with velocity components $v_i,\ 1\leq i\leq n$, and such that $v_i(t,.)\in C^2\cap H^2$ for all $t$ solves

$$\left\lbrace \begin{array}{l}\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t}-\nu\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 v_i}{\partial x_j^2}+\sum_{j=1}^n v_j\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_j}=\\ \\ \qquad\qquad \int_{{\mathbb R}^n}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}K_n(x-y)\right)\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_k}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k}\right)(t,y)dy,\\ \\ \mathbf{v}(0,.)=\mathbf{h},\end{array}\right. \tag{3}$$

for $1\leq i\leq n$, and vice versa. In this case the Poisson equation

$$-\Delta p=\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}v_j\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}v_k\right) \tag{4}$$

has the well-defined solution

$$p(t,x)=-\int_{{\mathbb R}^n}K_n(x-y)\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_k}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k}\right)(t,y)dy, \tag{5}$$

where

$$K_n(x):=\left\lbrace \begin{array}{ll}\frac{1}{2\pi}\ln|x|, & \mbox{if}\quad n=2,\\ \\ \frac{1}{(2-n)\omega_n}|x|^{2-n}, & \mbox{if}\quad n\geq 3\end{array}\right. \tag{6}$$

is the Poisson kernel. Here, we mention the case $n=2$ and invite the reader to apply the following argument in the case $n=2$. However, since this case is different from all cases $n\geq 3$ we assumed $n\geq 3$ above and stay with this assumption. We also mention that $|.|$ denotes the Euclidean norm and $\omega_n$ denotes the area of the unit $n$-sphere. In equation (3) we use the fact that the formula (5) has a well defined gradient such that

$$-\nabla p(t,x)=\int_{{\mathbb R}^n}\nabla K_n(x-y)\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_k}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k}\right)(t,y)dy. \tag{7}$$

This is the term we need to control in order to extend the scheme for the multivariate Burgers equation in [8] to the present situation. Note that for $n=3$ the functions

$$x\rightarrow\frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}K_n(x)=\omega_n^{-1}\frac{x_l}{|x|^n} \tag{8}$$

are not integrable outside a ball $B^n_R(0):=\{x||x|\leq R\}$ with origin 0 and radius $R>0$, i.e., are not in $L^1\left(\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B^n_R(0)\right)$. It is useful to note that we have local integrability in the $L_1$-sense of the first partial derivatives of the kernel $K$. For $n\geq 3$ we also have square integrability since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B^n_R(0)}\omega_n^{-1}\frac{|x_l|^2}{|x|^{2n}}dx\precsim\omega_n^{-1}\int_{r\geq R}\frac{dr}{r^{2n-2-n+1}}<\infty. \tag{9}$$

Integrability in the $L^1$-sense of functionals as in (7) is harder to achieve, even if we invoke partial derivatives using some information about the gradient of velocity. Note that even if we consider the second derivative we of the kernel, then we get

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}K_n(x):=\begin{cases}-\frac{nx_ix_j}{\omega_n}|x|^{-n-2}, & \text{if }\ i\neq j,\\ \\ \frac{|x|^2-nx_j^2}{\omega_n}|x|^{-n-2}, & \text{if }\ i=j,\end{cases} \tag{10}$$

and these functions are surely square integrable outside a ball around the origin for $n\geq 3$ but not intergable in the $L^1$ sense outside a ball around zero. Now the gradient of the pressure in (5) contains a source of a Poisson equation in the form

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_k}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k}\right). \tag{11}$$

If our approximations $v_i^{\rho,m,l}$ of the velocity components $v_k$ in (11) at each time step $l$ are in $H^2$ and have a uniform bound for all iteration step numbers $m$ of the approximation such that we have a bound $C+lC$ that is linear with respect to the time step number $l$, then we have the possibility to extend $L^2$-theory for constructive scheme of the multivariate Burgers equation [8] to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation. In this case we have for all approximations the pointwise relation

$$\begin{array}{ll}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_k^{\rho,m,l}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,m,l}}{\partial x_k}\right)(\tau,x)\\ \\ \leq\sum_{j,k=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(\frac{\partial v_k^{\rho,m,l}}{\partial x_j}\right)^2(\tau,x)+\left(\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,m,l}}{\partial x_k}\right)^2\right)(\tau,x)\end{array} \tag{12}$$

and the linear bound leads to the estimates

$$\begin{array}{ll}\left|\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_k^{\rho,m,l}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,m,l}}{\partial x_k}\right)\right|_{L^1}\leq\sum_{j,k=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\left(\left|v_k^{\rho,m,l}\right|_{H^1}+\left|v_j^{\rho,m,l}\right|_{H^1}\right)\\ \\ =n\sum_{k=1}^n\left|v_k^{\rho,m,l}\right|_{H^1}\leq n^2(C+lC)\end{array} \tag{13}$$

For the estimation of convolutions we use the generalized Young inequality, i.e., the fact that for $1 \leq p,q,r \leq \infty$

$$f \in L^q \text{ and } g \in L^p \ \rightarrow f * g \in L^r, \text{if } \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 + \frac{1}{r}, \tag{14}$$

and

$$|f * g|_{L^r} \leq |f|_{L^p} |g|_{L^q} \tag{15}$$

for a convolution $f * g$. So (13) together with (14) and (15) for $r = 2$ and $p = 1$ (estimate of the source), and $q = 2$ ($L^2$-estimate of the source outside a ball around zero) lead us close to an $L^2$-bound for the approximations of the gradient of the pressure. In order to show that our scheme is global next to a specific time scale we use properties of the convolutions (shifting derivatives) and the fact that the velocity approximations are in $H^2$. In order to achieve estimates in different function spaces we can extend this idea observing that the source in (11) contains derivatives which may be shifted to the kernel (by some elementary estimates and using partial integration) outside a ball of origin zero while inside this ball we may use the local regularity of the function in (5)- or its counterparts in the scheme. Now in a scheme we may consider local linearizations in which an approximation function $v_j^{f,\rho,l}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$ follows (with respect to an iteration) an approximation function $v_j^{g,\rho,l}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$ on a domain $D_l^\tau := [l-1, l] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with step size $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$ and transformed time $\tau = \rho_l \tau$ (similar as in [8]). We then have to find a linear bound on the growth of the velocity function components, i.e., a bound for differences of form (using Einstein notation for usual derivatives)

$$\begin{array}{l}
v_i^{f,\rho,l}(\tau,x) - v_i^{g,\rho,l}(\tau,x) = \\
= -\rho_l \int_{(l-1)}^{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(f_j - g_j\right)(s,y) \frac{\partial v_i^{g,\rho,l}}{\partial x_j}(s,y) \Gamma_f^l(\tau,x;s,y) dy ds + \\
\int_{l-1}^{\tau} \rho_l \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_{n,i}(z-y) \times \\
\Big( \Big( \sum_{j,k=1}^n \left(f_{k,j} + g_{k,j}\right)(s,y) \Big) \times \\
\left( \left(f_{j,k} - g_{j,k}\right)(s,y) \right) \Big) \Gamma_f^l(\tau,x;s,z) dy dz ds,
\end{array} \tag{16}$$

and where $\Gamma_f^l$ is the fundamental solution of the linear (scalar!) parabolic equation

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_f^l}{\partial \tau} - \rho_l \nu \Delta \Gamma_f^l + \rho_l \sum_{j=1}^n f_j \frac{\partial \Gamma_f^l}{\partial x_j} = 0. \tag{17}$$

For $n = 3$ the natural bound is with respect to a $H^2$-norm, and we shall see that can get a bound is with respect to the $H^m$-norm for $m$ arbitrary as well. A linear bound is sufficient by the choice of step size $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$.

This is the program of this paper. In the next section we reconsider the global scheme for the multivariate Burgers equation. Then in the last section we extend our considerations to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation.

## 2 The global scheme for the multivariate Burgers equation

Let us first reconsider the constructive approach to global existence for the Cauchy problem of the multidimensional Burgers equation in (1). The following considerations apply also to a class of initial-value boundary problems on different domains $[0,\infty)\times\Omega$ with $\Omega\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$. We assume smooth initial data $\mathbf{h}=(h_1,\cdots,h_n)^T$ where for all $1\leq i\leq n$ the functions $h_i$ have polynomial decay at infinity- this is essentially equivalent to the assumption $h_i\in H^s$ for all $1\leq i\leq n$ and $s\in\mathbb{R}$. We review some ideas in [8] from a slightly different point of view. Only ideas of proofs are given. We provide the details when we consider the extension to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation. The idea of the constructive approach to global existence and regularity for this Cauchy problem and related Cauchy problems is to set up an iteration scheme with respect to time $\tau=\rho_l t$ at each time step $l\geq 1$ and with a time step size

$$\rho_l\sim\frac{1}{l},\tag{18}$$

and such that at each time step an equation

$$\left\lbrace\begin{array}{ll}\frac{\partial u^{\rho,l}_i}{\partial\tau}=\rho_l\nu\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{\partial^2 u^{\rho,l}_i}{\partial x_j^2}-\rho_l\sum_{j=1}^n u^{\rho,l}_j\frac{\partial u^{\rho,l}_i}{\partial x_j},\\ \\ \mathbf{u}^{\rho,l}(l-1,.)=\mathbf{u}^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\end{array}\right.\tag{19}$$

is solved on the domain $[l-1,l]\times\mathbb{R}^n$. The solution is constructed via a functional series

$$u^{\rho,l}_i=u^{\rho,1,l}_i+\sum_k\delta u^{\rho,k+1,l}_i,1\leq i\leq n,\tag{20}$$

where $u^{\rho,1,l}_i$ solves

$$\left\lbrace\begin{array}{ll}\frac{\partial u^{\rho,1,l}_i}{\partial\tau}=\rho_l\left(\nu\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{\partial^2 u^{\rho,1,l}_i}{\partial x_j^2}-\sum_{j=1}^n u^{\rho,l-1}_j(l-1,.)\frac{\partial u^{\rho,1,l}_i}{\partial x_j}\right),\quad 1\leq i\leq n,\\ \\ \mathbf{u}^{\rho,1,l}(l-1,.)=\mathbf{u}^{l-1}(l-1,.),\end{array}\right.\tag{21}$$

and $\delta u_i^{\rho,k,l},\ 1\leq i\leq n$ solves

$$\left\lbrace\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{\partial \delta u_i^{\rho,k+1,l}}{\partial \tau}=\rho_l\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \delta u_i^{\rho,k+1,l}}{\partial x_j^2}-\sum_{j=1}^n u_j^{\rho,k,l}\frac{\partial \delta u_i^{\rho,k+1,l}}{\partial x_j}\right)\\
\\
\qquad\qquad -\rho_1\sum_j\left(\delta u_j^{\rho,k,l}\frac{\partial u^{\rho,k,l}}{\partial x_j}\right),\\
\\
\delta \mathbf{u}^{\rho,k+1,l}(l-1,.)=0,
\end{array}\right. \tag{22}$$

and where $\delta u_i^{\rho,k+1,l}=u_i^{\rho,k+1,l}-u_i^{\rho,k,l}$ for $k\geq 1$, and $\delta u_j^{\rho,1,1}=u_j^{\rho,1,1}-h_j$ at the first time step. We are interested in Cauchy problems of physical interest, and for this purposes it suffices to assume that

$$h_i\in H^s\equiv H^s\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right) \tag{23}$$

for all $1\leq i\leq n$ and $s\in\mathbb{R}$. Although the representations of the classical solutions of the members of the functional series $(\delta u_i^{\rho,k,l})$ in terms of fundamental solutions are not convolutions we may estmate them by convolutions using Gaussian a priori estimates of fundamental solutions. In order to do this we may use the Levy expansion of fundamental solutions as we did in [8] or we may use properties of the adjoint. For the estimation of convolutions we use the generalized Young inequality (14) and (15) above. This leads to

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $u_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\in H^s$ for all $1\leq i\leq n$ and for any given $s\in\mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$u_i^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.)\in H^s \text{ and } \delta u_i^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,.)\in H^s \tag{24}$$

*uniformly in $\tau$ and for all $1\leq i\leq n$ and all $s\in\mathbb{R}$. Furthermore,*

$$u_i^{\rho,l}(\tau,.):=u_i^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.)+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\delta u_i^{\rho,k,l}\in H^s. \tag{25}$$

*Proof.* We consider the case $n=3$ (the generalisation to $n>3$ is similar). This is proved for $H^2$ first with classical representations of the fundamental solution. The latter exists for $n=3$ since first order coefficients for the equation for $u_i^{\rho,1,l}$ are of form $u_j^{\rho,l-1}\in H^2$ and hence Hölder continuous. Inductively with the substep number $k\geq 1$ the same is true for the first order coefficients of the equation for $\delta u_i^{\rho,k+1,l}$. Then we may represent the solutions for $u_i^{\rho,1,l}$ and for $\delta u_i^{\rho,k+1,l}$ in terms of the fundamental solutions. Using the adjoint and partial integration we may represent the second derivatives of the solution by a representation which contains only first order derivatives of the respective fundamental solutions (cf. [8] of this paper or the next section of this paper). Then derivatives of first order of the fundamental solution have Gaussian a priori estimates. We can write down estimates which are convolutions, and then we may use the generalized Young inequality in order to establish $L^2$ estimates for these convolutions (using $L^1$ estmates of the Gaussian). Note that locally we may use the bound

$$\frac{C}{(t-s)^{\mu}(x-y)^{n+1-2\mu}} \tag{26}$$

for $0.5 < \mu < 1$ for the first derivative of the fundamental solution. From the classical representations of the functions $\delta u^{\rho,k,l}$ we get a contration property with respect to the $H^2$-norm uniformly $\tau$. This implies that the local limit function ($k \uparrow \infty$ is Hölder, and this implies that the limit function has a representations in terms of a fundamental solution. Higher order regularity may then be obtained by Gaussian estimates and the generalized Young inequality using partial integration and the adjoint. □

Now in addition we may prove that $u_i^{\rho,l}$ are differentiable with respect to $\tau$. Furthermore we need a bound on the first order coefficients $u_i^{\rho,l-1}$ which is independent of the time step number $l$. Indeed we have

**Lemma 2.2.**

$$|u_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)|_{\alpha} \leq C \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \tag{27}$$

*for a constant $C > 0$ which is independent of the time step number $l \geq 1$.*

*Proof.* Again we consider the case $n = 3$ We observe that the growth of $u^{\rho,l}$ is linear with respect to the time step number $l$. At each time step a time step size of order $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$ then ensures that the first order coefficients $u_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)$ for the equations for $u_i^{\rho,1,l}$ have a uniform bound (independent of the time step number $l$). □

Invoking classical regularity results for linear parabolic equations and induction over $l$ yields

**Theorem 2.3.** *The Cauchy problem (1) on $[0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with initial data $h_i \in H^s$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ has a global regular solution*

$$u_i \in C^{\infty}\left([0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n\right) \tag{28}$$

*along with $u(t,.) \in H^s$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$.*

This is not a new result but the proof is more elementary compared to an alternative method which establishes first the estimate

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\|u(t,.)\|_{H^s} \leq \|u(t,.)\|_{H^{s+1}} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq s} \|D^{\alpha}u_i D^{\beta}u_j\|_{L^2} - 2\|\nabla u\|^2_{H^s} \tag{29}$$

At first glance from the construction it seems that the estimate for the solution function $\mathbf{u}$ increases linearly on a time scale $\sum_{k=1}^{l} \rho_k$ with $\rho_k \sim \frac{1}{k}$, and, hence, quadratically on an uniform time scale. However, at each time step, if we have constructed $u_i^{\rho,l}(\tau,.) \in H^s$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ uniformly in $\tau$ with $\tau \in [l-1,l]$, then the construction gives

$$|u_i^{\rho,l}(\tau,.)|_{H^k} \leq |u_i^{\rho,l-1}(\tau,.)|_{H^k} + C_k \tag{30}$$

with a constant $C_k$ depending on $k$ according to the level of differentiability we want to obtain (accordingly the stepsize $\rho_l$ has to be chosen for each given $k$). However, the growth of size $C_k$ at each time step can be compensated by a choice $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{lC_k}$. Furthermore, we can easily deduce the existence of classical solutions $u^{\rho,l}$ of (19) at each time step. First we choose $k > m + \frac{1}{2}n$ in the construction above and obtain spatial differentiability of order $m$ uniformly with respect to $\tau$. Then the product estimate

$$|fg|_{H^s} \leq C_s |f|_{H_s} |g|_{H_s} \quad \text{for} \quad s > \frac{1}{2}n \tag{31}$$

gives

$$\frac{\partial u_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial \tau} = \rho_l \nu \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 u_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j^2} - \rho_l \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_j^{\rho,l} \frac{\partial u_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j} \in H^{k-2}. \tag{32}$$

Hence for choice $k > 2 + \frac{1}{2}n$ we have differentiability of $u_i^{\rho,l}$ with respect to time. The existence of a fundamental solution of the equation

$$\frac{\partial p^{\rho,l}}{\partial \tau} = \rho_l \nu \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 p^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j^2} - \rho_l \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_j^{\rho,l} \frac{\partial p^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j} \tag{33}$$

is ensured in terms of the known functions $u_j^{\rho,l}$ which are indeed now known to be Hölder continuous with respect to the time argument $\tau$ and the spatial argument $x$. Hence we have classical representations of the solution and an ordinary maximum principle for linear parabolic equations tells us that the maximum of the solution function $u^{\rho,l}$ does not increase over the time interval $[l-1,l]$. As the step size compensates the linear growth of the estimate immediately linked to the original construction this holds independently of the time step number $l$. We note

**Corollary 2.4.** *(Same assumptions as in theorem 2.3 above).*
*The solution* $\mathbf{u}$ *of (1) is bounded.*

## 3 Extension of the scheme to the incompressible Navier Stokes equation

Next we look at the relation to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation. We write it in the same scheme frame as above with time step number $l \geq 1$ and time step size $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$ at each time step number $l$. The velocity is denoted by $\mathbf{v}=(v_1,\cdots,v_n)^T$ (recall that $T$ is for 'transposed'). We have an additional scalar function $p$, and the equation system scheme becomes

$$\begin{cases}\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial\tau}=\rho_l\nu\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{\partial^2 u_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j^2}-\rho_l\sum_{j=1}^n v_j^{\rho,l}\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j}-\rho_l\frac{\partial p^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i},\\ \\ \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}^{\rho,l}=0\\ \\ \mathbf{v}^{\rho,l}(l-1,.)=\mathbf{v}^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.),\end{cases}\tag{34}$$

where for each $l\geq 1$ we consider this system on $[l-1,l]\times\mathbb{R}^n$. For $l=1$ the initial conditions are $\mathbf{v}^{\rho,1}(0,.)=\mathbf{v}^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)=\mathbf{h}(.)$ with the same $\mathbf{h}\in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$ as in the preceding section. The Leray projection form of these equations is obtained time-step by time-step by elimination of $p^{\rho,l}$ via an equation for $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}^{\rho,l}$ which simplifies by incompressibility (at each time step $l\geq 1$). First, this leads to the Poisson equation for $p^{\rho,l}(\tau,.)$ for $\tau\in[l-1,l]$, i.e.,

$$\Delta p^{\rho,l}=-\sum_{i,j=1}^n\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i},\tag{35}$$

where we suppress the notation of the evaluation at $\tau$ ($\tau$ serves as a parameter). Hence at each time step we have the local equation in Leray projection form of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation. If

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i}\right)(\tau,.)\tag{36}$$

is in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $\tau\in[l-1,l]$, then this is justified by a well-known result. Indeed we have

**Proposition 3.1.** *Assume that $n\geq 3$ and that $f\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and let $K$ be the fundamental solution of the Laplacian, i.e., of the equation*

$$\Delta K=\delta,\tag{37}$$

*where $\delta$ denotes the Dirac distribution. Then for $n\geq 3$*

$$K(x)=-\frac{|x|^{2-n}}{(2-n)\omega_n}\tag{38}$$

*(with $\omega_n$ being the surface area of the unit sphere) defines a distributive solution and determines a classical solution $w\in C^2$ defined by*

$$w(x):=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}f(y)K(x-y)dy\tag{39}$$

*of the Poisson equation*

$$\Delta w = f. \tag{40}$$

*Moreover, the gradient*

$$\nabla w(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y)\nabla K(x-y)dy \tag{41}$$

*is well-defined.*

Note that for application in our scheme $L^2$-theory for the data is enough in order to apply the proposition 3.1 since

$$\Big|\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j}(\tau,.)\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i}(\tau,.)\Big| \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j}\right)^2(\tau,.)+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i}\right)^2(\tau,.) \tag{42}$$

for any $\tau \in [l-1,l]$. This means that $v_i^{\rho,l} \in H^1$ implies that the left side of (42) is in $L^1$. Outside a ball we may then use that the first derivatives of the kernel $K_{,i}$ are in $L^2$ in order to estimate pressure terms. The truncation of the kernel inside a ball convoluted with the data is easier to handle. Indeed since the data are in our scheme at time step $l \geq 1$, i.e., $v_j^{\rho,l}(l-1,.)$, are in $H^2 \cap C^2$, and we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \Big|\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j}(l-1,.)\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i}(l-1,.)\Big| \leq nC\sum_{j=1}^n \Big|\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i}(l-1,.)\Big| \tag{43}$$

We may then use that the right side of (43) is in $L^2$ and together with the fact that the truncated kernel $1_{B_r(0)}K_{,i}$ is in $L^1$ the generalized Young inequality leads to the conclusion that the convolution with truncated kernel is also in $L^2$. Similar for first derivatives. Next we extend this standard lemma in order to meet these purposes. It is useful to have the gradient of the pressure in $L^2$ (resp. in $H^1$) since estimates in terms of convolutions of the modulus of the gradient with a Gaussian a priori estimate help us to conclude that the convolution bound is itself in $L^2$ (resp. in $H^1$). Note that the relationships in (14) and (15) make $L^2$-estimates for the gradient of the pressure useful in order to get $L^2$-estimates for the approximations $v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ of our scheme and their (weak) derivatives up to second order. Furthermore, if we want $L^\infty$-estimates for approximations $v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ and their (weak) derivatives up to second order, then $L^2$- estimates for the gradient of the pressure are also useful since the Gaussian is in $L^2$. We prove

**Lemma 3.2.** *For a multivariate function $f$ we say that $f \in H^k \equiv H^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if all multivariate derivatives $D_x^\alpha f$ with multiindex $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n)$, $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \leq k$ are in $L^2$. Similarly, for a multivariate function $f$ we say that $f \in H^{k,1} \equiv H^{k,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if all multivariate derivatives $D_x^\alpha f$ with* *multiindex* $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$, $\alpha_i \geq 0$ *and* $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \leq k$ *are in* $L^1$. *Accordingly we set* $H^0(\mathbb{R}^n) = L^2$. *For* $k \geq 0$ *assume that* $f_i, g_j \in H^{k+2} \cap C^2$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq n$, *and define for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} p^{f,g}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i} \right)(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} K(x-y) dy. \tag{44}$$

*Then we have* $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} p^{f,g} \in H^{k+1} \cap C^1$ *and* $p^{f,g} \in H^{k+2} \cap C^2$ *(defined accordingly). Moreover,*

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} p^{f,g} \right|_{H^{k+1}} \leq C + C \left( |f|_{H^{k+2}} + |g|_{H^{k+2}} \right) \tag{45}$$

*for some constant* $C > 0$. *Especially, in case* $n = 3$ *and if* $f, g \in H^2 \cap C^2$, *then we have* $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} p^{f,g} \in H^1 \cap C^1$ *and* $p^{\rho,f,g} \in H^2 \cap C^2$.

*Proof.* We consider the case $f, g \in H^2 \cap C^2$ and $n = 3$ which is essential. Note that the second derivatives of $f$ and $g$ are in $L^2 \cap C$, and therefore in the closed space of continuous functions vanishing at infinity. Hence they are bounded. The basic idea is is the following. The representation of the gradient of the pressure is a convolution of a (sum of) products of

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i} \tag{46}$$

with the gradient of the kernel $K$. Since for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \left| \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i} \right|(x) \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k} \right)^2 (x) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 (x), \tag{47}$$

it follows that the (sum of) product(s) function in (46) is in $H^{1,1}$ and its first order derivatives are in $L^1$ (since $f_j$ and $g_k$ are in $H^2$). In order to have the gradient of the pressure in $H^1$ the next idea is to split up the kernel $K$ (or a first order derivative of it) into two summands writing the gradient of the pressure functional as

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_i} p^{f,g}(x) &= \textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j} \right)(x-y) K_{,i}(y) dy \\ &= \textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j} \right)(x-y) \phi_{B_r}(y) K_{,i}(y) dy \\ &+ \textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j} \right)(x-y)(1-\phi_{B_r})(y) K_{,i}(y) dy, \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

along with a smooth function supported on a ball of radius $r > 0$ around $B_r(0)$ and zero elsewhere. Recall the Einstein notation where $K_{,i}$ denotes the partial $i$th derivative of the kernel function $K$. Note that the truncated kernel $\phi_{B_r}K_{,i}$ is in $L^1$ but not in $L^2$. Concerning the $L^2$-estimate of the gradient of the pressure functional this is no problem. For dimension $n=3$ we have that $\phi_{B_r}K$ is in $L^2$. Therefore, using convolution rule we may write the first term of (48) in the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)\phi_{B_r})(y)\right)_{,i}K(y)dy. \tag{49}$$

We may then use local $L^2$-integrability of $K=K_3$ (dimension $n=3$), since for the truncated integral we have

$$\int_{B_r}K_3(x)dx\sim\int_0^r|s|^{4-2n}s^2ds\sim r. \tag{50}$$

This is of use if we expand $\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)\phi_{B_r})(y)\right)_{,i}$ and write (49) as a sum of convolutions defining an appropriate function $\phi_{B_r}$ which has a compact support of first derivatives. If we consider derivatives of the gradient of the pressure functions we need another idea, but this works for the estimates within the gradient itself. Well, the localized terms are not really a problem since we can invoke local regularity theory for the Poisson equation. However, since second derivatives of the source function $f_j, g_k$ are continuous, there is also another possibility which also works for the second derivatives of the pressure functional $p^{f,g}$. We may write

$$\begin{array}{ll}\left|\frac{\partial^2p^{f,g}}{\partial x_i\partial x_m}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)\right)_{,m}\phi_{B_r})(y)K_{,i}(y)dy\right|\\ \leq\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}n\sum_{k=1}^nC\left|\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}(x-y)\right|\left|\phi_{B_r})(y)K_{,i}(y)\right|dy,\end{array} \tag{51}$$

for some $C>0$, and where we use the boundedness of $f\in H^2\cap C^2$ and its derivatives up to second order. Now the left side of (63) is in $L^2$ by the generalized Young inequality, since $K_{,i}\in L^1$ and second order partial derivatives of $g_k$ are in $L^2$. The second term on the right side of (48) may be estimated using the fact that the function $(1-\phi_{B_r})K_{,i}$ is square integrable since for $n=3$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_r(0)}(1-\phi_{B_r})\frac{x_i^2}{|x|^{2n}}dx\sim\int_{s\geq r}\frac{s^2}{s^6}s^2ds<\infty. \tag{52}$$

Now let us fill in some more details of this argument. First we specify $\phi_{B_r}$ to be $\phi_\epsilon$ where we write

$$\begin{array}{ll}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}p^{f,g}(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)K_{,i}(y)dy\\ =\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)K_{,i}(y)dy\\ +\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)(1-\phi_\epsilon(y))K_{,i}(y)dy,\end{array} \tag{53}$$

where

$$\phi_\epsilon(y)=\begin{cases}1 \text{ if } |y|\leq\epsilon,\\ \\ \exp\left(-\frac{1}{(2\epsilon^2-|y|^2)}\right) \text{ if } \epsilon^2\leq|y|^2\leq 2\epsilon^2,\\ \\ 0 \text{ else.}\end{cases}\tag{54}$$

Note that we have

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)\in C^1\cap L^1\tag{55}$$

because $f_j,g_k\in H^2\cap C^2$ and

$$\begin{array}{l}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x)\\ \\ \leq\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\right)^2(x)+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)^2(x).\end{array}\tag{56}$$

From proposition 3.1 we conclude that $p^{f,g}\in C^2$, hence $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}p^{f,g}\in C^1$. There are different methods to estimate the first summand on the right side of (53). We have seen one above. Another variation of argument is the following. We write

$$\begin{array}{l}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)K_{,i}(y)dy\\ \\ =\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)1_{\left\{|f_{j,k}(x-y)|\geq 1\ \&\ |g_{k,j}(x-y)|\geq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)K_{,i}(y)dy\\ \\ +\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)1_{\left\{|f_{j,k}(x-y)|\leq 1 \text{ or } |g_{k,j}(x-y)|\leq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)K_{,i}(y)dy\end{array}\tag{57}$$

For the first term on the right side of (57) we get for small $\epsilon>0$

$$\begin{array}{l}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)1_{\left\{|f_{j,k}(x-y)|\geq 1\ \&\ |g_{k,j}(x-y)|\geq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)K_{,i}(y)dybig|\right.\\ \\ \leq\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x)1_K\end{array}\tag{58}$$

for some compact set $K\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ because $f_j,g_k\in H^2\cap C^2$. Since $f_j,g_k\in C^2$ we have

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)1_K\in L^2.\tag{59}$$

With the same argument we get that the latter function in $H^1$ (differentiate the product and proceed as before). For the second term of (57) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right|1_{\left\{|f_{j,k}(x-y)|\leq 1 \text{ or } |g_{k,j}(x-y)|\leq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)\left|K_{,i}(y)\right|dy\\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right|1_{\left\{|f_{j,k}(x-y)|\leq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)\left|K_{,i}(y)\right|dy\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right|1_{\left\{||g_{k,j}(x-y)|\leq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)\left|K_{,i}(y)\right|dy\\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\right|1_{\left\{|g_{k,j}(x-y)|\leq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)\left|K_{,i}(y)\right|dy\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right|1_{\left\{|f_{j,k}(x-y)|\leq 1\right\}}(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)\left|K_{,i}(y)\right|dy.
\end{aligned}
\tag{60}
$$

Hence since $\phi_\epsilon K_{,i}\in L^1$, and $|g_{k,j}|\in L^2$ and $f_{j,k}\in L^2$ the function corresponding to the term in on the left side of (60) is also in $L^2$ by the generalized Young inequality. Again an analogous argument shows that this can be done for the second derivatives in the analysis of the pressure functional $p^{\rho,f,g}$. As we said, there are variations of this argument. Next to the arguments given for dimension $n=3$ we may use

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right|_{L^2}\leq C\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|f_jg_k\right|_{H_2}\\
&\leq CC_2\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left|f_j\right|_{H^2}\left|g_k\right|_{H_2}
\end{aligned}
\tag{61}
$$

by a standard estimate $\left|fg\right|_{H^s}\leq C_s\left|f\right|_{H^s}\left|g\right|_{H^s}$ for $s>\frac{1}{2}n$ This may be used for estimation of the first term on the right side of 53 were we have $\phi_\epsilon K_{,i}\in L^1$. Hence, we have

$$
x\to\rho\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j}\right)(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(y)K_{,i}(y)dy\in L^2 \tag{62}
$$

by the generalized Young inequality. However, for second derivatives we may need to describe the scheme in $H^m$ for larger $m$ in order to get estimates for the second derivatives. Note that we may also apply local regularity theory for Poisson equations for this part.

For the second summand term of the right side of (53) we may write with our specific function $\phi_\epsilon$

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( f_{j,k} g_{k,j} \right)_{,m} (x-y)(1-\phi_\epsilon)(y) K_{,i}(y) dy \Big|$$

$$= \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( f_{j,k,m} g_{k,j} + f_{j,k} g_{k,j,m} \right) (x-y)(1-\phi_\epsilon)(y) K_{,i}(y) dy \Big|$$

$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \tfrac{1}{2} \left( f^2_{j,k,m} + g^2_{k,j} + f^2_{j,k} + g^2_{k,j,m} \right) (x-y) \Big| (1-\phi_\epsilon)(y) K_{,i}(y) \Big| dy. \tag{63}$$

Then we may use the generalized Young inequality (this time observing that $\Big|(1-\phi_\epsilon)(y)K_{,i}\Big| \in L^2$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( f_j \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial x_j} \right)(.) \in L^1$ and we conclude that the function corresponding to the left side of (63) is in $L^2$. Again their are variation of this argument where me invoke second derivatives of $(1-\phi_\epsilon)(y)K_{,i}$. Summing up we get an upper bound of form

$$C + C \left( \max_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} |g_i|_{H^2} + |f_j|_{H^2} \right) \tag{64}$$

for some generic constant $C > 0$ as desired. The proof for $f_i g_j \in H^{k+2}$ with $k > 0$ is also similar. □

We need also standard Gaussian estimate for the fundamental solution and its first derivatives. We have

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let $D := [T_0, T_1] \times \overline{\Omega} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain along with $T_1 > T_0 > 0$, and let*

$$Lp \equiv \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} = 0 \tag{65}$$

*be an equation which satisfies*

- *i) $L$ is uniformly parabolic on the whole of $[T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$,*
- *ii) the coefficient functions $a_{ij}$ are uniformly Hölder continuous with Hölder constant $\alpha/2 \in (0, 0.5)$ with respect to time and Hölder constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$ with respect to the spatial variables, i.e., $a_{ij} \in C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(D)$,*
- *iii) the coefficient functions are Hölder continuous with Hölder constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and uniformly with respect to time $t$.*

*Then a fundamental solution $p$ of equation (65) exists and satisfies the Gaussian a priori estimates*

$$|p(t,x;s,y)| \leq \frac{C}{(t-s)^{n/2}} \exp\left( -\frac{\lambda (x-y)^2}{4(t-s)} \right), \tag{66}$$

*and*

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}p(t,x;s,y)\right| \leq \frac{C}{(t-s)^{(n+1)/2}}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda(x-y)^2}{4(t-s)}\right), \tag{67}$$

*for some constants $C>0$ and $\lambda>0$ ($\lambda$ less or equal to the lower ellipticity constant in general). Note that for $t>s$ these a priori bounds (as functions of $x-y$) with have a uniform bound in $L^1$.*

We also use some related standard results on the adjoint. We have

**Lemma 3.4.** *Assume that the assumptions of the preceding lemma are satisfied on a domain $D=[T_0,T_1]\times\mathbb{R}^n$, and that in addition we have*

- *i) The coefficient functions $a_{ij}$ and their first and second derivatives are bounded continuous functions on $D$,*
- *ii) the coefficient functions $b_i$ and their first and second derivatives are bounded continuous functions on $D$.*

*Then the fundamental solution $p^*$ of the adjoint equation $L^*p* = 0$ exists. Furthermore, for $t>s$*

$$p^*(s,y;t,x) = p(t,x;s,y) \tag{68}$$

*and analogous relations for the partial derivatives hold. Moreover, and satisfies the Gaussian a priori estimates*

$$|p^*(t,x;s,y)| \leq \frac{C}{(t-s)^{n/2}}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda(x-y)^2}{4(t-s)}\right), \tag{69}$$

*and*

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}p^*(t,x;s,y)\right| \leq \frac{C}{(t-s)^{(n+1)/2}}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda(x-y)^2}{4(t-s)}\right), \tag{70}$$

*for some constants $C>0$ and $\lambda>0$ ($\lambda$ less or equal to the lower ellipticity constant in general).*

Concerning these lemmas we note that in our scheme only the first order coefficients are variable. The useful relationship of the fundamental solution and its adjoint may also be verified directly using the Levy expansion as we did in [8]. We also discussed the matter in [7]. Our lemma 3.2 showed that we may base a global scheme for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation on approximations in Leray projection form which are $H^2$ with respect to the spatial variables. The scheme is in $H^2$ for fixed time with respect to the spatial variables (which is easier to see), and this helps us in order to estimate the gradient of the pressure functions of type $p^{\rho,f,g}$ in $H^1$ as in the lemma 3.2 above.

Next, for each $l \geq 1$ we consider the Lery projection form of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation at each time step $l \geq 1$, i.e.,

$$\left\lbrace \begin{array}{ll} \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial \tau} = \rho_l \nu \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j^2} - \rho_l \sum_{j=1}^n v_j^{\rho,l} \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j} \\ \\ +\rho_l \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l}}{\partial x_i} \right) (\tau, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} K_n(x-y) dy, \\ \\ \mathbf{v}^{\rho,l}(l-1,.) = \mathbf{v}^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.). \end{array} \right. \tag{71}$$

Next we may define a scheme similar to the scheme of the multivariate Burgers equation and with time step size $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$. Having computed $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \in H^2 \cap C^2$ we set up a local iteration scheme. In general, for $n \geq 3$ a condition of form $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \in H^m \cap C^2$ for an integer $m$ with $m > \frac{1}{2}n$ is an appropriate choice. But this is quite similar. Hence, think of $n = 3$ and of data and functional series approximations with $v_i^{\rho,k,l}(\tau.) \in H^2$ first. Again, the solution in Leray-projection form is constructed via a functional series

$$v_i^{\rho,l} = v_i^{\rho,1,l} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}, 1 \leq i \leq n, \tag{72}$$

where $v_i^{\rho,1,l}$ solves

$$\left\lbrace \begin{array}{ll} \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,1,l}}{\partial \tau} - \rho_l \left( \nu \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 v_i^{\rho,1,l}}{\partial x_j^2} - \sum_{j=1}^n v_j^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,1,l}}{\partial x_j} \right) \\ \\ = \rho_l \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_i} \right) (l-1, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} K_n(x-y) dy, \\ \\ \mathbf{v}^{\rho,1,l}(l-1,.) = \mathbf{v}^{l-1}(l-1,.), \end{array} \right. \tag{73}$$

and $\delta v_i^{\rho,k,l} = v_i^{\rho,k,l} - v_i^{\rho,k-1,l},\ 1 \leq i \leq n$ solves

$$\left\lbrace \begin{array}{ll} \frac{\partial \delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}}{\partial \tau} - \rho_l \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}}{\partial x_j^2} - \sum_{j=1}^n v_j^{\rho,k,l} \frac{\partial \delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}}{\partial x_j} \right) = \\ \\ -\rho_1 \sum_j \left( \delta v_j^{\rho,k,l} \frac{\partial v^{\rho,k-1,l}}{\partial x_j} \right) \\ \\ -\rho_l \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_{n,i}(x-y) \Big( \left( \sum_{j,k=1}^n \left( v_{k,j}^{\rho,k,l} + v_{k,j}^{\rho,k-1,l} \right) (\tau, y) \right) \times \\ \\ \left( \delta v_{j,k}^{\rho,k,l}(\tau, y) \right) \Big) dy \\ \\ \delta \mathbf{v}^{\rho,k+1,l}(l-1,.) = 0, \end{array} \right. \tag{74}$$

and where $\delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}=v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}-v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ for $k\geq 1$, and $\delta v_j^{\rho,1,l}=v_j^{\rho,1,l}-v^{\rho,0,l}:=v_j^{\rho,1,l}-v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)$. Note that $\delta v_j^{\rho,1,1}=v_j^{\rho,1,1}-h_j$ at the first time-step. The equations for $v_i^{\rho,1,l}$ and for $\delta v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ are linearized and localized equations where by localisation we mean the fact that the global integral terms in the equation for $v_i^{\rho,1,l}$ and for $\delta v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ are given in terms of the initial data and the data from the previous iteration step respectively. Assuming that $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\in H^2$ we show that $v^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.)$ in $H^2$ uniformly with respect to $\tau$ and that the series $\left(\delta v_i^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,.)\right)$ satisfies a contraction property in $H^2$ uniformly with respect to $\tau\in[l-1,l]$. We show that the functions $v_i^{\rho,1,l}$ are limits of a functional series where we have a contraction property for the elements of the series of form $\delta v^{\rho,k+1,l}$. This implies that the series (72) evaluated a $\tau\in[l-1,l]$ converges in $H^2$ such that for $n=3$ we may apply the following extension of a standard Sobolev lemma.

**Lemma 3.5.** *For $s=\alpha+k+\frac{1}{2}n$ with $\alpha\in(0,1)$ we have*

$$H^s\subset C^\alpha, \tag{75}$$

*where $C^\alpha$ is the space of Hölder-continuous functions.*

We note that the $L^p$ estimates which are useful for higher dimensions may be used in the context of a more general lemma. We have

**Lemma 3.6.** *For $s>k+\frac{n}{p}$ with $\alpha\in(0,1)$ we have*

$$H^{s,p}\subset C^k, \tag{76}$$

*where $H^{s,p}$ is the space of functions $f$ where $\Lambda^s f\in L^p$ along with*

$$\Lambda^s=\left[I-2\pi^{-2}\Delta\right]^{s/2}. \tag{77}$$

Applying such type of lemmas we can ensure that the first order coefficients (evaluated at time $\tau$) of the equations which determine our approximations $v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ satisfy classical conditions which are sufficient for the existence of fundamental solutions of the associated linear parabolic equations of our scheme. Especially first order coefficients evaluated at $\tau$ are in the Hölder space $C^\alpha$ for some $\alpha\in(0,0.5)$ and in $C^1_0$ uniformly with respect to $\tau$, i.e., the in the space of continuously differentiable functions which vanish at spatial infinity.

The construction here defines a weak solution in $H^2$ and in $H^{2,\infty}$ as $n=3$. We have not mentioned $H^{2,\infty}$-estimates explicitly, but the estimated above can be adapted straightforwardly. Note that the application of the generalized Young inequality is even more simple in this case: for $r=\infty$ we have $1+\frac{1}{r}=\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}$, and we may use $p=q=2$ outside a ball and $p=\infty$ and $q=1$ inside a ball. Since $v^{\rho,l}\in C^\alpha$ as the limit of the functional series in (72), we have representations in terms of $v^{\rho,l}$ in terms of the fundamental solution of

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial \tau}-\rho_l\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2 p_i}{\partial x_j^2}-\sum_{j=1}^{n}v_j^{\rho,l}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j}\right)=0, \tag{78}$$

and this leads to the immediate conclusion that the solution is classical. Note, however, that for local restrictions to a bounded domain $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ the series $v_i^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,.)|_\Omega$ converges to a limit $v^{\rho,l}(\tau,.)|_\Omega$ in a classical Banach space. Recall the following fact.

**Proposition 3.7.** *For open and bounded $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ and consider the function space*

$$\begin{array}{c}C^m(\Omega):=\Big\{f:\Omega\rightarrow\mathbb{R}|\ \partial^\alpha f\ \textit{exists for}\ \ |\alpha|\leq m\\ \textit{and}\ \partial^\alpha f\ \textit{has an continuous extension to}\ \overline{\Omega}\Big\}\end{array} \tag{79}$$

*where $\alpha=(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n)$ denotes a multiindex and $\partial^\alpha$ denote partial derivatives with respect to this multiindex. Then the function space $C^m\left(\overline{\Omega}\right)$ with the norm*

$$|f|_m:=|f|_{C^m\left(\overline{\Omega}\right)}:=\sum_{|\alpha|\leq m}\left|\partial^\alpha f\right| \tag{80}$$

*is a Banach space. Here,*

$$\left|f\right|:=\sup_{x\in\Omega}|f(x)|. \tag{81}$$

This leads to a second argument that the limit is indeed of form $v_i^{\rho,l}(\tau,.)\in H^2\cap C^2$ uniformly in $\tau$ and such that $\mathbf{v}^{\rho,l}$ satisfies the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation locally on $[l-1,l]\times\mathbb{R}^n$. This variation of argument has the advantage that it does not depend on dimension. On the other hand we can do the construction in $H^m$ instead of $H^2$ for $m>2+\frac{1}{2}n$, so this is a matter of taste. The last step then is to show that we have a linear bound of growth with respect to $H^2$. We shall show that

$$|v_i^{\rho,l}(l,.)|_{H^2}\leq|v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)|_{H^2}+C_2 \tag{82}$$

for a constant $C_2$ which is independent of the time step number $l$ and which holds for all $1\leq i\leq n$. This implies that we have a global bound

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq n}|v_i^{\rho,l}(l,.)|_{H^2}\leq\max_{1\leq i\leq n}|h_i|_{H^2}+lC_2 \tag{83}$$

Now let us consider this program of proof in more detail. First we observe

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\in H^2\cap C^2$ for all $1\leq i\leq n$. Then there exists a classical solution $v_i^{\rho,l}$ of (73) with*

$$v^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.)\in H^2\cap C^2 \tag{84}$$

*for all $\tau \in [l-1,l]$. Moreover, for $n=3$ we have*

$$v^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.) \in H^{2,\infty}, \tag{85}$$

*where the latter space denotes the Sobolev space with weak derivatives up to second order in $L^{\infty}$.*

*Proof.* Since $v_i^{r,\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \in H^2$ we have $v_i^{r,\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \in H^2 \cap C^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0,0.5)$. Hence the fundamental solution $p^l$ of

$$\frac{\partial p^l}{\partial \tau} - \rho_l \nu \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 p^l}{\partial x_j^2} + \rho_l \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_j^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\frac{\partial p^l}{\partial x_j} = 0 \tag{86}$$

exists (constructible in the classical sense by the Levy expansion) and the solution of the Cauchy problem in (73) has the representation

$$\begin{array}{l} v_i^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,y)p^l(\tau,x,l-1,y)dy \\ +\rho_l \int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial v_k^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j}\right)(l-1,y)K_{n,i}(z-y)\times \\ \times p^l(s,x,l-1,z)dzdyds. \end{array} \tag{87}$$

Here, recall that $K_{n,i}$ denotes the partial first order derivative of the kernel $K_n$ with respect to the $i$th variable. Hence we have $v_i^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.) \in C^2$ for all $\tau \in [l-1,l]$ which follows from classical analysis of the Levy expansion of the fundamental solution where we may differentiate under the integral in order to get a representation for the derivatives of first order for $\tau > l-1$. Moreover, the second derivatives of the last integral in (87) have an adjoint representation (cf. also the argument in [?] and [7]) such that the second derivatives of $v_i^{\rho,1,l}$ with respect to the spatial variables $x_k$ and $x_m$ is the sum of

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,y)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_k \partial x_m}p^l(\tau,x,l-1,y)dy \tag{88}$$

(which exists since $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)$ is Hölder), and the second summand

$$\begin{array}{l} +\rho_l \int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{p,j=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(\frac{\partial v_p^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_p}\right)(l-1,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}K_n(z-y)\times \\ \times\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}p^{l,*}(s,x,l-1,z)dzdyds \end{array} \tag{89}$$

(for the adjoint $p^{l,*}$ cf. also [8] and [7] ). The term

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_k}\frac{\partial v_k^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j}\right)(l-1,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}K_n(z-y)dy \tag{90}$$

corresponds to an $L^2$-function according to our lemma 3.2 above (and to a $L^2$-function if $n = 3$), and Gaussian estimates for the first derivatives of the fundamental solution and its adjoint plus an application of Young's inequality in its generalized form ensure that (89) is in $L^2$ for each $\tau$ (first the integrand is in $L^2$ for each $s \in [l-1, \tau]$ and then the integral up to $\tau$ is in $L^2$ where $\tau$ is considered as an parameter). Note that the Gaussian a priori estimate of the fundamental solution in lemma 3.3 is $L^1 \cap L^2$ for fixed $\tau > s$. Similar for the Gaussian a priori estimate in lemma 3.4. Let us look at the second term more precisely since this is the term which defines the extension of our scheme for the multivariate Burgers equation. We have

$$\begin{array}{l}
+\rho_l \int_{l-1}^{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_i} \right) (l-1, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} K_n(z-y) \times \\
\\
\times \frac{\partial}{\partial x_m} p^{l,*}(s, x, l-1, z) dz dy ds \\
\\
\leq \rho_l \int_{l-1}^{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( \frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial v_k^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j} \right) (l-1, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} K_n(z-y) \right| \times \\
\\
\times \left| \frac{C}{(t-s)^{(n+1)/2}} \exp\left( -\frac{\lambda(x-y)^2}{4(t-s)} \right) \right| dz dy ds.
\end{array} \tag{91}$$

Now our lemma 3.2 and the generalized Young inequality in (14) and (15) with $r = 2$ and $p = 2$ and $q = 1$, i.e.,

$$f \in L^2 \text{ and } g \in L^1 \ \rightarrow f * g \in L^2, \text{if } 1 + \frac{1}{2} = 1 + \frac{1}{r}, \tag{92}$$

and

$$|f * g|_{L^2} \leq |f|_{L^2} |g|_{L^1} \tag{93}$$

where $f$ corresponds to the Leray projection solution of the gradient of the pressure analyzed in lemma 3.2 and $g$ corresponds to the Gaussian a priori bound where we observe that for $t > s$ we have

$$y \rightarrow \frac{C}{(t-s)^{(n+1)/2}} \exp\left( -\frac{\lambda(y)^2}{4(t-s)} \right) \in L^p. \tag{94}$$

for $p \geq 1$. Similarly for the first term. Moreover, from the representation of both summands we observe that $v_i^{\rho,1,l} \in C^2$. We note that for $n = 3$ we may apply lemma 3.2 and the generalized Young inequality in (14) and (15) for $r = \infty$ and $p = q = \frac{1}{2}$ in order to get $L^\infty$ estimates. $\square$

Next in order to construct a local solution of the Navier-Stokes equation we establish a contaction property for the correction functionals $\delta v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ of the first linear approximation $v_i^{\rho,1,l}$ considered above.

**Lemma 3.9.** *If $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \in H^2 \cap C^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ then there is a contraction property*

$$|\delta v^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,.)|_{H^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}|\delta v^{\rho,k-1,l}(\tau,.)|_{H^2}. \tag{95}$$

*Moreover, if $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \in H^2 \cap C^2$ this is a contraction in $|.|_2$ such that restrictions of the functional series to a bounded domain $\Omega$ converge in a classical Banach space of twice differentiable functions with continuous extension at the boundary , i.e. $\left(v_i^{\rho,k,l}|_\Omega\right)$ converges in the classical Banach space described in proposition 3.7 for $m = 2$. Moreover, for $n = 3$ we also have the contraction estimate*

$$|\delta v^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,.)|_{H^{2,\infty}} \leq \frac{1}{2}|\delta v^{\rho,k-1,l}(\tau,.)|_{H^{2,\infty}}. \tag{96}$$

*Proof.* We prove the theorem in case $n = 3$. This implies that we can apply the product rule (31) with $s = 2 > \frac{3}{2} = \frac{n}{2}$. The generalisation to dimension $n > 3$ can be done similarly but with $H^{s,p}$-estimates (cf. our remarks on $H^{s,p}$-estimates and lemma 3.2 above). At each substep $k$ of time-step $l \geq 1$ we may assume inductively that

$$v_j^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,.) = v_j^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.) + \sum_{m=2}^{k} \delta v^{\rho,m,l}(\tau,.) \in H^2 \subset C^\alpha \tag{97}$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 0.5)$ and uniformly with respect to $\tau \in [l-1, l]$. Moreover, we know inductively that $v_j^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,.) \in C^2$ for all $\tau \in [l-1, l]$. For $k = 1$ (when we interpret the second summand in (97) to be zero) we know this from the previous lemma. Hence inductively with respect to the subiteration index $k$ we know that the fundamental solution $p^{k,l}$ of

$$\frac{\partial p^{k,l}}{\partial \tau} - \rho_l \nu \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \delta p^{k,l}}{\partial x_j^2} + \rho_l \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_j^{\rho,k,l} \frac{\partial p^{k,l}}{\partial x_j} = 0 \tag{98}$$

exists, and it follows that the solution of the linear problem (74) has the representation

$$\begin{array}{l}
\delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}(\tau,x) = \\
-\rho_l \int_{l-1}^{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_j \left( \delta v_j^{\rho,k,l} \frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,k-1,l}}{\partial x_j} \right)(s,y) p^{k,l}(\tau,x,s,y) dyds \\
+\rho_l \int_{l-1}^{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_{n,i}(z-y) \Big( \left( \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \left( v_{k,j}^{\rho,k,l} + v_{k,j}^{\rho,k-1,l} \right)(\tau,y) \right) \times \\
\left( \delta v_{j,k}^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,y) \right) \Big) p^{k,l}(\tau,x,s,z) dydsdydz.
\end{array} \tag{99}$$

For the first order derivatives we have the representation

$$\begin{array}{l}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}\delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}(\tau,x)=\\ -\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_j\left(\delta v_j^{\rho,k,l}\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,k-1,l}}{\partial x_j}\right)(s,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}p^{k,l}(\tau,x,s,y)dyds\\ +\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}K_{n,i}(z-y)\Big(\left(\sum_{j,p=1}^n\left(v_{k,p}^{\rho,k,l}+v_{p,j}^{\rho,k-1,l}\right)(\tau,y)\right)\times\\ \left(\delta v_{j,p}^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,y)\right)\Big)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}p^{k,l}(\tau,x,s,z)dydsdydz,\end{array}\tag{100}$$

and for the second order derivatives we have the representation

$$\begin{array}{l}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_m\partial x_q}\delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}(\tau,x)=\\ +\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_j\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}\left(\delta v_j^{\rho,k,l}\frac{\partial v^{\rho,k-1,l}}{\partial x_j}\right)(s,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_q}p^{k,l,*}(\tau,x,s,y)dyds\\ +\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}K_{n,m}(z-y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\Big(\left(\sum_{j,p=1}^n\left(v_{p,j}^{\rho,k,l}+v_{p,j}^{\rho,k-1,l}\right)(\tau,y)\right)\times\\ \left(\delta v_{j,p}^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,y)\right)\Big)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_q}p^{k,l,*}(\tau,x,s,z)dydsdydz,\end{array}\tag{101}$$

and where $p^{k,l,*}$ denotes the adjoint (consider also part I of this article). The following contraction estimate involves an estimate for

$$v_i^{\rho,k,l}=v_i^{\rho,l,1}+\sum_{m=1}^{k}\delta v_i^{\rho,m,l}\tag{102}$$

because of the nonlinearity in the first order coefficients. This involves the estimation of $v_i^{1,\rho,l}$. Recall that we have the representation in (87) such that

$$\begin{array}{l}v_i^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,x)-v^{\rho,0,l}(\tau,x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,y)p^l(\tau,x,l-1,y)dy-v^{\rho,0,l}(\tau,x)\\ +\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{i,j=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_i}\right)(l-1,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}K_n(z-y)\times\\ \times p^l(s,x,l-1,z)dzdyds.\end{array}\tag{103}$$

Well, we defined $v^{\rho,0,l}(\tau,x)=v^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)$. We could have defined $v_i^{\rho,0,l}$ such that the first summand on the right side of (103) cancels. Anyway classical analysis tells us hat there is a bound in the relevant norms. The essential term is the second summand which we may estimate using lemma

3.2. For the equation in (104) we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial x_m\partial x_q}\delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}(\tau,.)\Big|_{L^2}\\
&\leq \rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\Big|\sum_j \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_m}\left(\delta v_j^{\rho,k,l}\tfrac{\partial v_i^{\rho,k-1,l}}{\partial x_j}(s,.)\right)\Big|_{L^2}\Big|\tfrac{C}{(\tau-s)^{(n+1)/2}}\exp\left(-\tfrac{\lambda(.)^2}{4(\tau-s)}\right)\Big|_{L^1}ds\\
&+\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Big|K_{n,m}(.-y)\Big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(\sum_{j,p=1}^{n}\left(v_{p,j}^{\rho,k,l}+v_{p,j}^{\rho,k-1,l}\right)(s,y)\right)\times\\
&\left(\delta v_{j,p}^{\rho,k,l}(s,y)\right)\Big)dy\Big|_{L^2}\Big|\tfrac{C}{(\tau-s)^{(n+1)/2}}\exp\left(-\tfrac{\lambda(.)^2}{4(\tau-s)}\right)\Big|_{L^1}ds\\
&\leq \rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\Big|\sum_j \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_m}\left(\delta v_j^{\rho,k,l}\tfrac{\partial v_i^{\rho,k-1,l}}{\partial x_j}\right)\Big|_{L^2}C_2C'ds\\
&+\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}K_{n,m}(z-y)\Big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(\sum_{j,p=1}^{n}\left(v_{p,j}^{\rho,k,l}+v_{p,j}^{\rho,k-1,l}\right)(\tau,y)\right)\times\\
&\left(\delta v_{j,p}^{\rho,k,l}(\tau,y)\right)\Big)dy\Big|_{L^2}C'ds\\
&\leq \rho_l\Big|\delta v_j^{\rho,k,l}\Big|_{H^2}\Big|v_i^{\rho,k-1,l}\Big|_{H^2}C_2C'\\
&+\rho_l\sum_p\Big|v_p^{\rho,k,l}+v_p^{\rho,k-1,l}\Big|_{H^2}\Big|\delta v^{\rho,k,l}\Big|_{H^2}CC_2C'\\
&\leq \rho_l\sum_p\Big|v_p^{\rho,k,l}+v_p^{\rho,k-1,l}\Big|_{H^2}\Big|\delta v^{\rho,k,l}\Big|_{H^2}C^*,
\end{aligned}\tag{104}$$

where we use the product rule (31) above with the constant $C_2$, the uniform bound

$$\Big|\frac{C}{(\tau-s)^{(n+1)/2}}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda(.)^2}{4(\tau-s)}\right)\Big|_{L^1}\leq C',\tag{105}$$

lemma 3.2 (therefore an additional constant $C$ for the second summand), and the generalized Young inequality in (14) and (15) above. Moreover, we may choose $C^*\geq CC_2C'$. For generic $C^*$ if follows that

$$\Big|\delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}(\tau,.)\Big|_{H^2}\leq \rho_l C^*\sum_p\Big|v_p^{\rho,k,l}+v_p^{\rho,k-1,l}\Big|_{H^2}\Big|\delta v^{\rho,k,l}\Big|_{H^2}.\tag{106}$$

Note also that we used that

$$\big|\phi_\epsilon K_{,i}\big|_{L^1}\leq C\tag{107}$$

for some constant $C>0$ (this does not hold for $L^2$, but leads to $L^2$-estimate for a convolution with convoluted $L^2$-data via the generalized Young inequality). Next, in order to estimate $\rho_l C^*\sum_p\Big|v_p^{\rho,k,l}+v_p^{\rho,k-1,l}\Big|_{H^2}$ we first estimate

$$\begin{array}{l}\sum_p \left|v_p^{\rho,1,l}+v_p^{\rho,0,l}\right|_{H^2}=\sum_p \left|v_p^{\rho,1,l}+v_p^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\right|_{H^2}\\ =\sum_p \left|v_p^{\rho,1,l}-v_p^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)+2v_p^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\right|_{H^2},\end{array}\tag{108}$$

and then proceed by induction over $k$ showing that a certain choice of $\rho_l$ is appropriate. We assume inductively that for all $1\leq i\leq n$

$$|v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)|_{H^2}\leq C^*+(l-1)C^*\tag{109}$$

for some generic constant $C^*>0$ and $l\geq 1$. Note that for $l=1$ we have $|h_i(l-1,.)|_{H^2}\leq C^*$ for all $1\leq i\leq n$ for some generic $C^*$. In order to start the (sub-)induction for $k=1$ we go back to representation in (103). We have to estimate

$$\begin{array}{l}\left|v_i^{\rho,1,l}(\tau,.)-v^{\rho,0,l}(\tau,.)\right|_{H^2}\leq\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,y)p^l(\tau,x,l-1,y)dy-v^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)\right|_{H^2}\\ +\left|\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{i,j=1}^n\left(\frac{\partial v_i^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_i}\right)(l-1,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}K_n(z-y)\times\right.\\ \left.\times p^l(s,.,l-1,z)dzdyds\right|_{H^2}\end{array}\tag{110}$$

for all $\tau\in[l-1,l]$. For the second term we may use the techniques of lemma 3.2, especially the $H^2$-estimates of convolutions together with a priori estimates of the fundamental solutions of adjoints and their first derivatives in $L^1$-norm. This together with the generalized Young inequality leads to the estimate of linear growth. Note that we involve $H^2$-estimates since we have linear growth of the function $v^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)$ with respect to the $H^2$-norm. Especially, second derivatives are represented and estimated such that the highest order terms (partial derivatives of second order with respect to the variables $x_m$ and $x_q$ of the $|.|_{H^2}$-norm become

$$\begin{array}{l}\left|\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,p=1}^n\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(\frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_p}\frac{\partial v_p^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j}\right)(l-1,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}K_{n,m}(z-y)\times\right.\\ \left.\times p^{l,*}_{,q}(s,.,l-1,z)dzdyds\right|_{L^2}\\ \leq\left|\rho_l\int_{l-1}^{\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{j,p=1}^n\left(\left|\frac{\partial^2 v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_p\partial x_i}\right|^2+\left|\frac{\partial v_p^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j}\right|^2\right)(l-1,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}K_{n,m}(z-y)\times\right.\\ \left.\times\frac{C}{(t-s)^{(n+1)/2}}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda(.-z)^2}{4(\tau-s)}\right)dzdyds\right|_{L^2}\end{array}\tag{111}$$

The latter term is a double convolution where we may estimate the Gaussian a priori estimate in an $L^2$-norm and the convolution function function

$$y \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{j,p=1}^{n} \left( \Big| \frac{\partial^2 v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_p \partial x_i} \Big|^2 + \Big| \frac{\partial v_p^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j} \Big|^2 \right) (l-1,y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} K_{n,m}(z-y) dy \tag{112}$$

in $L^2$-norm along the techniques of lemma 3.2 invoking the generalized Young inequality in order to get an $L^1$-bound $n^2 C(C^* + (l-1)C^*)$. Note that this is not trivial because $K_{n,m}(.)$ is only locally in $L^2$, i.e., is in $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}$, so this requires the techniques of lemma 3.2. Next note that the first order coefficient of the equation for the fundamental solution $p^l$ are of form $\rho_l v_i^{r,l-1}(l-1,.)$ which has a $H^2$-bound independent of the time-step number $l$ for the choice $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$. Then applying the generalized Young inequality once again we get(with another generic $C$-factor from $L^2$-integral of the Gaussian and collecting summands of the $H^2$-norm) the inequality

$$\begin{array}{l} \Big| \rho_l \int_{l-1}^{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{j,p=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial v_j^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_p} \frac{\partial v_p^{\rho,l-1}}{\partial x_j} \right) (l-1,y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} K_n(z-y) \times \\ \times p^{l,*}(s,.,l-1,z) dz dy ds \Big|_{H^2} \leq n^2 C^2 (C^* + (l-1)C^*). \end{array} \tag{113}$$

Furthermore, looking at the first summand on the right side of (114) we find

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,y) p^l(\tau,x,l-1,y) dy - v^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \Big|_{H^2} \leq C^* \tag{114}$$

with generic $C^* > 0$ and choice

$$\rho_l = \frac{1}{4(n^3 C^2 C^* (C^* + lC^*))} \tag{115}$$

for some constant $C^*$ and greater than $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |h_i|_{H^2}$ ( which otherwise depends on dimension $n$ and the parameters of the Gaussian a priori estmate). With this choice we get

$$\Big| \delta v_i^{\rho,2,l}(\tau,.) \Big|_{H^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \Big| \delta v^{\rho,1,l} \Big|_{H^2}. \tag{116}$$

and

$$\Big| \delta v_i^{\rho,k+1,l}(\tau,.) \Big|_{H^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \Big| \delta v^{\rho,k,l} \Big|_{H^2}. \tag{117}$$

from the definition of $v_i^{\rho,k,l}$ immediately by induction on $k$ where analogous Gaussian estimates involving the fundamental solution $p^{k,l}$ and its adjoint can be invoked. □

We note that we may extend this lemma by analogous methods to Sobolev spaces which is useful especially for $n > 3$. The extension is especially easy if we consider the $H^m$ estimates only at integer time points $l \geq 1$ which is sufficient if we add a little classical regularity theory for the appoximating functionals.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let* $v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.) \in H^m$ *For* $l \geq 1$ *and* $\rho_l$ *as chosen above we have*

$$v_i^{\rho,0,l}(l,.) \in H^m \text{ and } \delta v^{\rho,k,l}(l,.) \in H^m \tag{118}$$

*and*

$$|\delta v_i^{\rho,0,l}(l,.)|_{H^m} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \tag{119}$$

*and for* $k \geq 1$

$$|\delta v_i^{\rho,k,l}(l,.)|_{H^m} \leq \frac{1}{2}|\delta v^{\rho,k-1,l}(l,.)|_{H^m} \tag{120}$$

*for all* $1 \leq i \leq n$ *and all* $k \geq 0$ *and* $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

We have indeed linear growth on a time scale $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$.

**Lemma 3.11.** *For all* $m \geq 0$ *there is a a constant* $C_m$ *independent of the time step number* $l$ *such that*

$$|v_i^{\rho,l}(l,.)|_{H^m} \leq |v_i^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)|_{H^m} + C_m \tag{121}$$

For $m = 2$ the proof of this lemma is included in the proof of lemma 3.9 above. From the latter lemma we conclude that we have linear growth on a time scale defined by the time step size $\rho_l \sim \frac{1}{l}$. This implies that the first order coefficients of the linearized equations for $v_i^{\rho,0,l}, 1 \leq i \leq n$ are uniformly bounded, i.e., we have for any Hölder norm $|.|_\alpha$ with Hölder coefficient $\alpha \in (0,1)$

$$|\rho_l v^{\rho,l-1}(l-1,.)|_\alpha \leq C \tag{122}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independently of the time step number $l$. Moreover, we have Hölder continuity of all correction terms $\delta v_i^{\rho,k,l}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $k \geq 1$ uniformly in $\tau \in [l-1, l]$ and independently of the time step number $l \geq 1$. This implies that the scheme is global.

The argument we have proposed here is considerable simpler then the argument in [6] where a dynamic control function is used. On the other hand, the dynamic control function may stabilize the scheme and allows for a uniform step size. It may also be used in other situations. Adding a control function as in [6] also leads to a globally bounded solution immediately, while a little additional argument is needed in the line of argument of this paper. Note that the present argument also leads to a different proof of the classical proofs for global $L^2$-existence in [3] and [9]. It would be interesting to apply the scheme using probabilistic methods considered in [1], [2], [5], and [4].

---

[1] `kampen@wias-berlin.de, kampen@mathalgorithm.de`.

# References

[1] Fries, Christian; Kampen, Jörg: Proxy Simulation Schemes for generic robust Monte Carlo sensitivities, process oriented importance sampling and high accuracy drift approximation (with applications to the LIBOR market model), Journal of Computational Finance, Vol. 10, Nr. 2, 97-128, 2007.

[2] Fries, C., Kampen, J. *Global regularity, existence and a probabilistic scheme for a class of ultraparabolic equations* (in preperation)

[3] Hopf, H. *Über die Anfangswertaufgabefür die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen*, Math. Nachr.4, 213-231,1951.

[4] Kampen, J., Kolodko, A., Schoenmakers, J., *Monte Carlo Greeks for financial products via approximative transition densities*, Siam J. Sc. Comp., vol. 31 , p. 1-22, 2008.

[5] Kampen, J., *Global regularity and probabilistic schemes for free boundary surfaces of multivariate American derivatives and their Greeks*, Siam J. Appl. Math. 71, pp. 288-308.

[6] Kampen, J., *A global scheme for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation on compact Riemannian manifolds*, arXiv: 1205.4888v4, (June 2012)

[7] Kampen, Jörg: *Constructive analysis of the Navier-Stokes equation.* arXiv10044589 (v6), 2012

[8] Kampen, J. *On the multivariate Burgers equation and the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation (part I)*, arXiv:0910.5672v5 [math.AP] (2011)

[9] Leray, J. *Sur le Mouvement d'un Liquide Visquex Emplissent l'Espace*, Acta Math. J. (63), 193-248, (1934).